

REMARKS

Examiner's comments in the Office Action marked "non-final" and dated March 15, 2007 have been read and carefully considered by Applicants. In view of such comments, Applicants have amended the set of claims as set forth herein. In particular, independent claims 1, 9, 21, 29, and 40 and also dependent claims 11, 12, and 15 have all been amended to better highlight the patentable differences of Applicants' proposed invention as compared to the prior art cited by Examiner in the Office Action. In amending these claims, however, Applicants maintain that no new matter has been impermissibly introduced into the present Application. In addition thereto, Applicants have also newly cancelled dependent claims 4, 5, and 8 and further added new dependent claims 51 and 52. In adding dependent claims 51 and 52, Applicants again maintain that no new matter has been impermissibly introduced into the present Application. (Applicants' Specification, see ¶ 0023, 0028, 0041, and 0075). In view of such, therefore, claims 1, 2, 9-12, 15, 21, 23-26, 28-40, and 42-52 remain pending in Applicants' present Application for Examiner's consideration, while cancelled claims 3-8, 13, 14, 16-20, 22, 27, and 41 are all now withdrawn from Examiner's consideration.

At the present time, it is Applicants' good faith belief that the pending claims, as presented herein, are both novel and non-obvious. Therefore, Applicants respectfully aver that the pending claims now place the present Application in a condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Drawings:

In the present Amendment, Applicants have amended Figure 4 of the Application. (See REPLACEMENT SHEET for Figure 4 submitted herewith.) In particular, the numerical designation for the "Plane 1 Display" in Figure 4 has been changed from "166" to "167." Such an amendment has been made so as to properly distinguish the "Plane 1 Display" in Figure 4 from block 166 in Figure 5. (See also Applicants' corresponding amendment to ¶ 0063 of the Specification as set forth hereinabove.) In so amending Figure 4, Applicants respectfully maintain that no new matter has been impermissibly introduced into the present Application.

Amendments to the Specification:

In the present Amendment, Applicants have also amended paragraphs 0034, 0061, 0063, and 0077 of the Specification. (See ¶ 0034, 0061, 0063, and 0077 as amended hereinabove.) In general, these paragraphs have been amended so as to merely correct simple word mistakes or clarify sentence meanings. Support in the Application as originally filed for making most of these amendments can be found upon brief review of Figures 4 and/or 5. Therefore, in so amending these paragraphs in the Specification, Applicants respectfully maintain that no new matter has been impermissibly introduced into the present Application.

Objections to the Claims:

In the Office Action, Examiner objected to claims 9-12 and 15 as substantially being written duplicates of claims 1, 4, 5, and 8. In response, Applicants have herein cancelled dependent claims 4, 5, and 8 and also amended both independent claims 1 and 9 so that the subject matter set forth and claimed in claim 9 is distinctive from that in claim 1. In so amending claims 1 and 9, however, Applicants respectfully maintain that no new matter has been impermissibly introduced into the present Application.

Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-12, and 15 stand rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,980,626, which was issued to Burkhard Groh *et al.* on December 27, 2005 (hereinafter "Groh"), in view of Japanese Patent Application Number 10-275378, which was published for Nonaka Hideki on April 11, 2000 ("Hideki"). Also in the Office Action, claims 21, 23, and 28 stand rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over Groh in view of United States Patent Number 5,021,770, which was issued to Kazuo Aisaka *et al.* on June 4, 1991 ("Aisaka"), and in further view of United States Patent Number 6,244,507, which was issued to Harry Garland *et al.* on June 12, 2001 ("Garland"). Moreover, in the Office Action, claims 24-26 stand rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over Groh in view of Aisaka, in view of

Garland, and in further view of United States Patent Number 4,426,725, which was issued to John Grady on January 17, 1984 ("Grady"). Further in the Office Action, claims 29-37 stand rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over Groh in view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2005/0267351, which was published for Louis Humphrey *et al.* on December 1, 2005 ("Humphrey"). Also in the Office Action, claim 38 stands rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over Groh in view of Humphrey, and in further view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2001/0051881, which was published for Aaron Filler on December 13, 2001 ("Filler"). Moreover, in the Office Action, claim 39 stands rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over Groh in view of Humphrey, in view of Filler, and in further view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0194035, which was published for Andrew DiRienzo on December 19, 2002 ("DiRienzo"). Further in the Office Action, claims 40, 42, 43, and 46 stand rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over Groh in view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0169847, which was published for Andrew Karellas *et al.* on September 11, 2003 ("Karellas"), and in further view of United States Patent Number 6,920,465, which was issued to Wataru Motoki on July 19, 2005 ("Motoki"). Also in the Office Action, claims 44 and 45 stand rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over Groh in view of Karellas, in view of Motoki, and in further view of United States Patent Number 6,628,745, which was issued to Martin Annis *et al.* on September 30, 2003 ("Annis"). Furthermore, in the Office Action, claims 47-49 stand rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over Groh in view of Karellas, in view of Motoki, and in further view of United States Patent Number 6,504,897, which was issued to Hisashi Yonekawa on January 7, 2003 ("Yonekawa"). Lastly, in the Office Action, claim 50 stands rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over Groh, in view of Karellas, in view of Motoki, in view of Yonekawa, and in further view of United States Patent Number 6,005,911, which was issued to Lim Cheung on December 21, 1999 ("Cheung").

In response to Examiner's claim rejections in the Office Action, Applicants have herein amended independent claims 1, 9, 21, 29, and 40 and also dependent claims 11, 12, and 15. In addition, Applicants have also newly cancelled dependent claims 4, 5, and 8 and also newly

added dependent claims 51 and 52. In view of such claim amendments, Applicants now respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections set forth in the Office Action.

CONCLUSION

In view of the set of claims as amended and also the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 21, 29, and 40, as well as claims 2, 10-12, 15, 23-26, 28, 30-39, and 42-52 dependent thereon, are non-obvious with respect to the teachings of Groh, Hideki, Aisaka, Garland, Grady, Humphrey, Filler, DiRienzo, Karellas, Motoki, Annis, Yonekawa, and Cheung. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued for all claims 1, 2, 9-12, 15, 21, 23-26, 28-40, and 42-52.

Should Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter now of record, Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at (248) 433-7200.

Respectfully submitted,

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC



John A. Artz, Reg. No. 25,824
38525 Woodward Avenue, Suite 2000
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304-5092
telephone: (248) 433-7200
facsimile: (248) 433-7274

Dated: September 17, 2007